

"Recently the engineers sent the land owners a card on which to note their own classification of their holdings and the assessed valuations. An airplane photographic survey is about to be made. From these sources, added to the field survey, the facts as to classification and total assessed valuations will be obtained; then damages will be estimated and settlement attempted, first by negotiation, and, if necessary, by court procedure.

"Actual values of lands in the flood way are extremely difficult to determine, since there is no market value and returns have been low in recent years. Actual investment deserves consideration. The owners of several of the best places stated that they had spent \$100 to \$150 per acre on clearing, tile drainage, and improvements, often exclusive of the original cost of the bare land.

"A large percentage of the farm land has been mortgaged, usually at \$50 to \$75 per acre. Loans coming due are being foreclosed unless part cash is put up. Large tracts are being taken over by insurance and loan companies and operated by farm managers. Two good crops at good prices will put many of these farms on their feet, but they will practically all be tenant operated, and the area will thus be lost to the home-making element.

"A Cairo banker when asked about these conditions, stated that all of southeast Missouri is in the same condition; few new loans are possible, and, indeed, the owners in the floodway are a better risk than those outside, since there is the prospect of actual cash forthcoming from claims. Others added that the claim moneys have long ago been encumbered by loans and the loan money spent beyond recall. The prospect that construction will bring in a lot of money is a poor reliance, and only the gas stations and personal-service merchants are likely to benefit materially, said an engineer. Thus does local opinion vary.

FARMING WILL DECREASE

"My own opinion is that the extent of future farming depends on many factors. At first the fuse-plug operator will not be controlling. The farmer will put in a crop, provided he has the money to do so. If bank money is tight and city credit stiff, the farmed acreage will shrink. Every adverse reaction due to a crevasse or to money stringency or crop failure will cause a further shrinkage in the next year's acreage.

"Federal land banks will not loan money in the flood way, and therefore individual farming will progressively go out. Insurance and loan company holdings will persist for many years, but the least profitable pieces and those affected by crevasse-filled ditches will be abandoned. No new cut-over lands are likely to be reclaimed. Owners of the present timberlands, such as the 20,000-acre tract owned by the Three-State Lumber Co. in the southern overflow area, west of the Dorena crevasse, will welcome any contribution from the Government, cut-off the timber, and then abandon the practically valueless land. All told, then, the salvage on the flood-way area will not be large.

"But besides this there are the near-by areas outside the flood way. Consequential damages to this territory will be considerable, and are most difficult to estimate. It is hard enough to estimate loss of trade territory and prospective business, but still harder to decide on compensation. The probable effect is illustrated by the present expectation that two typical towns, East Prairie (population 1,500) and Charleston (population 4,000), will lose one-third their population. The total business from the 2,500 people in the flood way may be estimated at from \$500,000 to \$750,000 per year. Shrinkage of town population will shrink values 25 to 50 per cent. Realignment of taxes and shifting from abandoned flood-way lands to lands outside will lay down another heavy burden on outside lands. Must not all these losses be set down in drawing up the economic balance sheet?

"The engineering investigations reveal a remarkable amount of excellent work by the engineers in the office of the Memphis engineer district of the Corps of Engineers. Col. F. B. Wilby is in charge of this district, but much of the hydraulic study has fallen to the lot of William Parkin, Blair Ross, and Henry Bloompot, civilian engineers in the general engineering division, of which Mr. Parkin is in charge. An area engineer, T. T. Knappen, has opened an office at Cairo with a large corps of office and field engineers, who have the field work and working drawings for the construction nearing the contract stage."

A vigorous protest against the final adoption of the Army flood-control plan has been set forth by the Missouri Flood Control Association and the Tensas Basin Flood Control Association through Lucius T. Berthe, their consulting engineer. A recent communication says:

"The awarding of contracts for actual construction in the Missouri flood way mentioned has been temporarily deferred by the Secretary of War pending a possible review of this situation. Almost equally doubtful are the effectiveness and economic advisability of the great flood ways proposed in the Boeuf and Atchafalaya areas. Senators and Congressmen from nine valley States recently joined in a request to the President for a review of these three controversial features of the plan prior to commencement of construction of same.

"The lack of confidence in either its effectiveness or equity as being carried out by the Army engineers appears widespread. This is espe-

cially true as related to the great engineering profession of the country and the flood-subject valley itself, with whom the present flood-control agency has gone bankrupt of public confidence.

"In the face of these facts, shall the present agency be permitted to rush the Nation blindfolded, so to speak, into an investment which will probably exceed a half billion dollars with such uncertainty of results? Should we not take at least one look before leaping into this abyss of certain failure? No private business would ever accept such hazard. Is there any reason why, regardless of Army ideals and discipline, the Nation should not exercise common prudence and business judgment in the expenditure of such a sum as is herein involved? Have we reached the point where the Chief of Engineers of the Army can discipline the Nation itself?"

RECESS

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement hitherto entered into, now take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 3 o'clock p. m.), under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, June 13, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, June 12, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein.

For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in his holy place?

He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "An act to establish a Federal farm board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries," further insists upon its amendment to said bill disagreed to by the House of Representatives, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McNARY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. RANDELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a chart and comments thereon prepared by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], touching the effect on Tennessee of the pending tariff bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a chart and comments thereon by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following compilation of data and comments thereon touching the effect of the pending tariff measure on agriculture and manufacturing in Tennessee, prepared by my distinguished colleague, Judge CORDELL HULL.

The statement is as follows:

TENNESSEE

[1925 figures unless otherwise stated]

Total population, 1920, 2,337,885.

Total farm population, 1920, 1,173,316.

Value of farm lands and buildings, 1920, \$1,024,979,000.

Value of farm lands and buildings, 1925, \$759,426,000.

	Acres
Land in farms.....	17,801,000
Total crop land, 1925.....	7,588,506
Crop land harvested, 1924.....	6,209,428
Crop land idle or failure, 1924.....	1,379,078
Number of farms.....	252,669

The following receive no tariff benefits:

Tennessee crops, 1925, \$195,200,000

	Value	Acreage
Cotton and seed (517,000 bales).....	\$48,133,000	1,173,000
Corn.....	56,284,000	3,162,000
Wheat.....	7,616,000	367,000
Oats.....	3,112,000	221,000
Barley.....	557,000	22,000
Rye.....	286,000	20,000
Potatoes.....	4,040,000	37,000
Sweet potatoes.....	4,536,000	36,000
Tobacco.....	16,045,000	479,000
Tame hay (1927).....	26,430,000	1,162,000
Sorghum (value of sirup alone).....	2,149,000	63,000
Strawberries.....	3,012,000	24,628
Apples.....	4,169,000	
Total.....	176,269,000	6,766,628
Crop land in 1925.....		7,588,506
Remainder for other crops (1925).....		821,876

But several hundred thousand acres always lie idle and the crop falls on other thousands.

Such specialties as the following receive some tariff benefits:

	Value	Acreage
Peanuts (1928).....	\$677,000	21,903
Tomatoes (shipped).....	1,285,000	13,888
Clover seed.....		2,000
Pecans (trees).....		23,595
Soy beans.....	2,696,000	114,000
Onions.....		694

Tennessee produces a few millions dollars of other truck products and numerous fruits, but net tariff benefits in most instances are comparatively small or none at all. This is especially true when we consider the increased production and living costs due to general tariffs. At the most Tennessee only utilizes a few hundred thousand acres of the 7,588,506 acres planted to crops in the production of less than \$5,000,000 to \$7,000,000 of minor products that get any net tariff benefits. Peanuts, lettuce, tomatoes, clover seed, onions, soy beans, and a limited number of other minor products enjoy, at times at least, some tariff aid, which should be frankly recognized.

This small tariff help we have to compare with crops of \$176,269,000 and more, raised on 6,766,628 acres and more that suffer enormous tariff penalties. More than 95 per cent of the State's acreage planted to crops and of their values experience no net tariff benefits but tariff injuries. In this 95 per cent of crop lands is where the farmer's capital is chiefly invested.

Livestock, 1925

Value of all livestock.....	\$83,473,000
Livestock and its products receiving no tariff benefits:	
Lard and all hog products.....	9,138,528
Horses and mules.....	39,762,000
Total.....	48,900,528

As to cattle, the prices in the United States made no material increase after the tariffs of 1921 and 1922, but it was not until around 1927 that the price increase became really substantial. That tariffs were not a material factor in this price increase is testified to by the United States Secretary of Agriculture in his annual report for 1928, as follows:

"It was not until 1927 that market supplies of cattle were reduced sufficiently to cause a material rise in the general level of cattle prices. * * * From 1918 to 1928 the number of cattle was reduced by 15,500,000 head, and also 23,000,000 more American consumers were added by reason of increase of population."

This is high protective tariff authority. The cattle grower does recall that during the six years of these tariffs, from 1921 to 1927, he did not receive any satisfactory price increases. But even the small cattle raiser is taught high-tariff protection and taught to follow and support the manufacturers' embargo tariffs, which are effective in their benefits and which enable the manufacturer to eat up the farmers who receive small or theoretical tariff benefits on some of their products. Just here is room for a valuable mathematical calculation by the farmer. In order to secure moderate tariffs for certain agricultural products that are more or less benefited thereby, American agriculture is not called upon to stand for the existing structure of superprotection for a small segment of American manufacturers.

Value of cattle, 1925.....	\$21,944,000
Value of sheep.....	1,940,000
Value of wool.....	399,562
Total.....	24,333,562
Total number of sheep in Tennessee.....	289,577
Number shorn.....	262,116
Wool derived..... pounds.....	1,065,650

The wool averages less than 40 cents a pound and 4 pounds to the clip, compared with 9 or 10 pounds to the clip of the fine wool sheep mainly in the range and Western States. Our Tennessee wools are medium or coarse and sell for less than one-half the amount of the finer wools, which derive 90 per cent of the wool tariff benefits.

It is apparent that our small sheep owners, as in Tennessee, pay out more in tariff prices for woolen clothing for themselves and families than the small amount they derive from wool production. Theirs is a mutton and lamb proposition with wool as the incident. If the fine wool grower should have enough sheep to produce all the wool America needs, he would cause the market for mutton and lamb to be hopelessly glutted the year around.

If, however, we agree that the tendency of the cattle and sheep tariffs is to afford more or less benefits to the owners, especially during periods of scarcity or fluctuation of prices here and abroad, it is patent that such benefits are not comparable with those received by manufacturing industries. Just here is the point at which the farmer is often misled by the wholly false plea that tariffs benefit all alike.

Dairy products

Total value (1925).....	\$15,817,000
Butter made on Tennessee farms (1924)..... pounds.....	32,461,000
Butter fat sold..... do.....	5,209,000
Cream sold..... gallons.....	698,000

For 1924, 1925, 1926, and 1927 the dairyman in the eastern or competitive zone received an average tariff benefit on butter of slightly under 6 cents a pound, and also certain tariff benefits on milk and cream, especially in territory tributary to the Canadian border.

Tennessee in 1924 milked 350,578 dairy cows of a total in the United States of 16,511,235. To the extent that our local market for butter was influenced by the national central markets, the Tennessee dairyman derived tariff benefits from butter as above indicated. From these, however, he must deduct his general tariff losses. A serious problem just ahead is that of overproduction. This will measurably nullify tariff benefits.

Eggs

Total value of eggs.....	\$11,067,000
--------------------------	--------------

The Nation produces near \$500,000,000 of eggs, while imports and exports as well are near \$7,000,000 a year. In this trade situation it is difficult to figure out any substantial tariff benefits for eggs.

The value of poultry (1925) was \$9,665,000.

This is a by-product of farming, but a very valuable one to the extent it prevails. The imports of live poultry to-day are about \$378,000, with exports of a little less than one-half this amount. The number of poultry for the Nation in 1924 was 240,000,000 and for Tennessee was 11,860,000, or less than 5 per cent of the Nation's total.

The imports of dressed poultry ranges from \$800,000 to \$1,467,000. The exports average near the same amount. The total production was 600,000,000 pounds in 1924. The imports and exports are 3,500,000 to 5,000,000 pounds each. The value of our national production is from \$150,000,000 to \$180,000,000. One can easily judge from these figures that the tariff benefits from poultry are not comparable with most of the manufacturers' tariffs, such as Mr. Mellon's 76 per cent on aluminum products, and scores of others that might be mentioned.

Value of mineral production, 1926

[No tariff benefits]

	Annual production
Total.....	\$39,296,668
Coal and coke.....	12,208,000
Cement.....	8,352,000
Copper.....	2,604,000
Iron ore.....	312,109
Pig iron.....	2,544,825
Petroleum.....	100,000
Phosphate rock.....	1,980,613
Sand and gravel.....	1,751,336
Silver and gold.....	73,500
Stone.....	4,170,000
Sulphuric acid.....	(?)
Total.....	34,096,383

The following receive some tariff benefits:

	Value of annual production
Zinc.....	\$1,814,000
Lead, bauxite, manganese, barite, clay products, slate, etc. (this is excessive).....	7,105,000
Lime.....	1,319,000
Total.....	10,238,000

Lime production and that as to several miscellaneous items means little or nothing.

More than three-fourths of all minerals in Tennessee get no tariff protection and could not use it if they did. They suffer serious tariff burdens instead. Why not give them consideration?

Manufacturing industries

Production, 1925.....\$601,488,000
Wage earners.....107,645

No tariff benefits as to the following:

	Annual production
Bread and bakery products.....	\$10,100,000
Canning and preserving fruits and vegetables.....	1,858,000
Beverages.....	4,413,000
Shoes.....	6,616,000
Car-repair construction shops (electric).....	629,552
Car-repair construction shops (railroad, etc.).....	26,711,000
Carriages, wagons, etc., and materials.....	1,695,000
Coke.....	1,386,000
Confectionery.....	6,261,000
Druggist preparations.....	1,928,000
Fertilizers.....	5,015,000
Flour and other mill products.....	31,810,000
Food preparations n. e. s.....	40,297,000
Gas.....	3,174,000
Ice cream.....	2,981,000
Ice.....	3,977,000
Lumber and timber products n. e. s.....	35,527,000
Planing-mill products.....	26,086,000
Signs and advertising novelties.....	675,000
Saddlery and harness.....	1,767,000
Paving materials other than brick.....	616,000
Agricultural implements.....	1,180,000
Leather belting.....	169,000
Concrete products.....	877,000
Leather.....	3,154,000
Vehicle bodies and parts.....	4,961,000
Cottonseed oil, cake, and meal.....	23,045,000
Paper and wood pulp.....	4,062,000
Patent medicines.....	5,628,000
Printing and publishing, book and job.....	7,038,000
Printing and publishing, newspaper, etc.....	14,365,000
Slaughtering and meat packing.....	13,846,000
Tobacco, chewing and smoking, snuff.....	16,819,000
Wood, turned and carved.....	2,873,000
Wood distillation and charcoal.....	2,028,000
Total.....	313,417,000

If we make specially full allowance of tariff benefits to such manufactures as woolen, cotton, and other textiles, including knit goods, shirts, clothing, etc., tools, tinware, sporting and athletic goods, paper boxes, mirrors, perfumery, trunks and bags, awnings and tents, mattresses and bed springs, clay products, chemicals, caskets and coffins, certain paints and varnishes, marble work, advanced iron and steel manufactures, and furniture, it is apparent that from one-half to two-thirds of what is listed as manufacturing production does not enjoy any net tariff benefits. The chief portion of our cotton textile and hosiery production of \$67,706,000, embracing medium and coarser yarns and their products, are on an export basis and would be perfectly content with moderate tariff rates instead of continuing as a party to the policy of superprotection. It is therefore apparent that agriculture as a whole, most all of the mineral industry, the larger portion of manufacturing, and the general public in Tennessee, suffer large net tariff losses. Their interest manifestly would be in harmony with moderate or competitive tariffs, so as to reduce production costs, living and transportation costs, and promote wider and better foreign markets for our increasing surpluses.

POINT OF NO QUORUM

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present. I withdraw the point, temporarily, Mr. Speaker.

EXPORT BOUNTIES

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. GARNER. May I ask on what subject?

Mr. TEMPLE. To insert in the RECORD, after having made some comments thereon, certain laws of European countries with regard to their treatment of goods which have received an export bounty from the country from which they are sent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, all the Members of the House are familiar with the fact that on our own statute books there is a law which provides that when goods arrive in the United States, upon which a bounty has been paid in the country from which they are exported, we add to the ordinary tariff duties a sum equivalent to the whole amount of the bounty which they have received from the country from which they are exported.

It struck me, a few weeks ago, it would be worth while to inquire what foreign countries in Europe and in other parts of the world, to which we export agricultural commodities, have a similar law on their statute books. I wrote to Mr. Chalmers, the Chief of the Division of Foreign Tariffs in the Bureau of

Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce, whose business it is to keep informed with regard to the tariff laws of foreign countries, and asked him if he could furnish me with these laws.

I have here extracts from the laws of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and other countries. The French law is very brief, and for that reason I shall read it as a specimen of the provisions of such statutes. It is the law of March 29, 1910, and is still in force:

The government * * * may apply to articles, dutiable or free, enjoying in their country of origin or production a direct or indirect export bounty, a countervailing duty equal to the export bounty.

Now, it struck me it would be of very little advantage to a man who exports wheat from the United States to receive 21 cents a bushel when he exports it and to pay into the treasury of the country to which he takes it 21 cents a bushel for the privilege of landing it there.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Do they not also have a retaliatory tariff just the same as they have retaliation because of the export-premium proposition?

Mr. TEMPLE. They have tariffs and sometimes they proceed to retaliate; yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will not the same objection, about which the gentleman is speaking, apply to a tariff?

Mr. TEMPLE. Perhaps so; but it is nevertheless a very decided objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. But we still have the tariff law in spite of those objections.

Mr. TEMPLE. All right; the gentleman has said his say; now let me proceed.

Whatever may be true about retaliatory tariffs of various sorts and countervailing duties which are for a purpose entirely different, I want to call specific attention to the purpose of the debenture.

It is intended that the man who exports goods will sell those goods abroad, let us say wheat, for example. He must sell for the world price in the world market—whatever price he can get abroad. Under the proposed debenture plan he would receive whatever the wheat would bring in the market in which he would sell it, and in addition would get 21 cents a bushel from the due bill or debenture issued and receivable by the United States Treasury for every bushel of wheat that he exported. It was intended that he should be able to pay over a considerable portion of the 21 cents a bushel to the American farmer from whom he buys the wheat, thus raising the American price by nearly 21 cents a bushel above the world price. Now, if he pays the 21 cents a bushel to the French treasury for the privilege of landing it in France, how much of the 21 cents can he give to the American farmer from whom he bought the wheat? And how would it benefit the American farmer if the exporter takes 21 cents out of the United States Treasury and pays it into the treasury of a foreign country?

This is all I have to say at present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. How about Great Britain?

Mr. TEMPLE. There is no such law on the statute books of Great Britain, but it would not take very long to enact one there.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The board of trade in Great Britain has wide powers relative to all matters of tariffs and shipments—

Mr. TEMPLE. And dumping laws.

Mr. CHINDBLOM (continuing). And foreign commerce, and they can inaugurate practically a new system without much legislation, if any.

Mr. TEMPLE. That could be done in a single day.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. COLE. I have investigated this question, and, as a matter of fact, in Great Britain they would cover a situation like this by an order in council.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; it would not require an act of Parliament.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They do not have to take such matters to Parliament.

Mr. TEMPLE. No. [Applause.]

The matter referred to above follows:

THE UNITED STATES LAW

Tariff act of 1922, Title III, section 303. (U. S. Stat., vol. 42, pt. 1, p. 935)

That whenever any country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government, person, partnership, association, cartel, or corporation shall pay or bestow, directly or indirectly, any bounty or grant upon the manufacture, production, or export of any article or merchandise manufactured or produced in such country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government, and such article or merchandise is dutiable under the provisions of this act, then upon the importation of any such article or merchandise into the United States, whether the same shall be imported directly from the country of production or otherwise, and whether such article or merchandise is imported in the same condition as when exported from the country of production or has been changed in condition by remanufacture or otherwise, there shall be levied and paid in all such cases, in addition to the duties otherwise imposed by this act, an additional duty equal to the net amount of such bounty or grant, however the same be paid or bestowed.

MAY 28, 1929.

CHIEF OF THE DIVISION OF FOREIGN TARIFFS,

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce,

Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHALMERS: Goods upon which an export bounty has been paid in the country from which they are shipped are subject to an additional duty equal to the bounty when they are imported into the United States. (Act of September 21, 1922, Title III, section 303.) Will you please let me know what foreign countries have a similar provision of law imposing additional duties on imports on which export bounty is paid by the country of their origin?

Especially I should like to know what is the law of England, France, Italy, and Germany in this respect.

Very truly yours,

H. W. TEMPLE.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE,

Washington, May 31, 1929.

Hon. H. W. TEMPLE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter of May 28, asking what foreign countries have a provision of law imposing additional duties on bounty-fed imports, I take pleasure in inclosing a memorandum listing the foreign countries which, to our knowledge, have such legislation, with extracts of the pertinent sections.

You will note that England, Italy, and Germany have no such legislation, although, of course, in the case of emergency, the necessary enactments could, undoubtedly, be put through in short order.

Cordially yours,

HENRY CHALMERS,
Chief, Division of Foreign Tariffs.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE,

DIVISION OF FOREIGN TARIFFS,

Washington, April 27, 1929.

FOREIGN COUNTERVAILING DUTIES ON BOUNTY-FED GOODS

(Extracts from laws)

Part I. Europe

AUSTRIA

Law of September 5, 1924

In regard to goods upon which a direct or indirect export bounty is granted in the country of export, the Federal Government may, by and with the advice of the principal committee of the national council, establish by ordinance a duty or surtax to the amount of the bounty as granted; it is, moreover, empowered to increase up to one-third of the rate provided in the tariff the duties on industrial products or countries which have not ratified the Washington convention of 1919, limiting the hours of work, and which in their present labor regulations are considerably below the provisions of the said convention.

BELGIUM

Law of January 30, 1893 (No. 2218)

ART. 2. The Government is authorized to establish on the importation of such goods as enjoy a direct or indirect bounty on export from the country whence proceeding or originating, a countervailing duty equal to said bounty.

Above is reaffirmed by article 8 of the law of October 10, 1900, and by article 5 of law of May 8, 1924.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Law of June 22, 1926 (effective July 14, 1926)

ART. 8. If goods imported into Czechoslovakia from any country menace the national production through unfair competition, resulting from special governmental dispositions of any kind, such as by the granting of favors upon exportation or otherwise, with the introduction of longer working hours, or other unfavorable social conditions of labor, and the like, or resulting from depreciated currency, measures shall be taken adequate for the indispensable protection of domestic production, and, in particular, by fixing a special duty or a surtax, or by limiting importation. For the observation of such phenomena, the Government shall appoint a board ("consulta") for which there shall be proposed two members by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, two by the Minister of Finance, and two by Minister for Agriculture.

FRANCE

Law of March 29, 1910

Ex. ART. 3. The Government * * *

"May apply to articles, dutiable or free, enjoying in their country of origin or production a direct or indirect export bounty, a countervailing duty equal to the export bounty."

PORTUGAL

Law No. 8741 of 1921

ART. 7. When the Government is satisfied that any article, whether liable to import duty or not, enjoys in the country of origin or shipment any direct or indirect export premium, or is characterized by any other form of dumping, the customs shall levy, in addition to the ordinary duty, a charge equivalent to the premium enjoyed by such article.

SPAIN

Law of March 20, 1906 (embodied in the customs law of March 23, 1906, art. 3, and still in effect).

ART. 6. The Government is authorized to levy such surcharges as they see fit on goods which receive export bounties in the country of production.

SWITZERLAND

Customs law of October 10, 1902 (still in effect)

ART. 4. It shall be lawful for the Federal Council to increase at any time to such an extent as they may deem fit the rates of the general tariff. * * *

In cases where any measures adopted in a foreign country are likely to interfere with the trade of Switzerland, and also in cases where the application of the Swiss customs duties proves inoperative owing to export bounties or like grants, the Federal Council are empowered, in a general way, to take measures deemed fit to meet the circumstances.

Part II. Orient

JAPAN

Law No. 54, of April 14, 1910

ART. 5. In respect of articles on which an export bounty is granted in foreign countries, a customs duty of the same amount as the said bounty may be imposed by imperial ordinance in addition to the duty prescribed in the tariff.

AUSTRALIA

Preservation of Industries act, 1921, freight subsidies or concessions

ART. 7. (1) If the minister is satisfied after inquiry and report by the tariff board that any goods exported to Australia of a class or kind produced or manufactured in Australia have been or are being carried (a) in subsidized ships at rates of freight lower than the rates of freight prevailing at the date of shipment; or (b) at ballast rates of freight, being rates lower than the rates of freight prevailing at the date of shipment; or (c) freight free; or that by reason of the granting of rebates, refunds, or other allowances the net amount of freight payable on goods exported to Australia of a class or kind produced or manufactured in Australia is lower than the rates of freight prevailing at the date of shipment, and that in any such case detriment may thereby result to an Australian industry, the minister may publish a notice in the Gazette specifying the goods as to which he is so satisfied.

(2) Upon the publication of the notice there shall be charged, collected, and paid to the use of the King, for the purposes of the Commonwealth, on those goods imported into Australia a special duty (in this section referred to as "the dumping freight duty").

(3) The rate of the dumping freight duty shall be 5 per cent of the fair market value of the goods at the time of shipment.

NEW ZEALAND

Customs amendment act, 1921

SEC. 11. (2):

(c) In the case of goods imported into New Zealand, or in the case of goods of a class or kind produced in some other part of the British Dominions and imported from a country not being part of the British Dominions, if the minister is satisfied that any special concession (whether by way of railway or shipping freight, subsidy, special bounty,

rebate, or otherwise) has been or is to be allowed, taken, or granted, and if such concession will, in the opinion of the minister, have an effect prejudicial or injurious to any industry or business established or carried on in New Zealand or in such other part of the British Dominions as aforesaid. For the purposes of this section the determination by the minister of the amount of any such concession shall be final.

(3) The rate or amount of dumping duty levied under this section shall be determined, as follows. * * *

(c) In the case of goods to which paragraph (c) of the last preceding subsection applies, the dumping duty shall be an amount, to be determined by the minister, not exceeding the amount of the special concession referred to in the said paragraph.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar were provided in 1903.

General countervailing duties were provided in the customs act of 1914 and also in the act of 1925.

The provision of 1925 is as follows:

"CH. 11, ART. 15. (1) Whenever, after investigation and report by the board of trade and industries, the minister is satisfied that goods which are of a class or kind produced or manufactured in the Union have been or are being exported to the Union."

(e) That a bounty has been or will be granted in respect of such goods in the country in which they were produced or manufactured or from which they were exported, by way of a bonus, rebate, subsidy, or otherwise, whether granted by a government or other authority or person.

Part III. Latin America

ARGENTINA

Law No. 8377, of 1912

ART. 2. On the importation of sugar entitled to direct or indirect bounties in country of origin there shall be a surtax equivalent to the full amount of the bounties granted, whatever be the form of the grant.

NOTE.—Proposed legislation in the interest of the sugar growing reembodies this provision in a new form. There is also a proposed general antidumping law which introduces a general provision for all imports similar to the present one in effect for sugar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SUTHERLAND (at the request of Mr. DOWELL) for six days, on account of important business.

POINT OF NO QUORUM

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment? I would like to have five minutes, and I would just as soon have it now.

Mr. DYER. There are a number of gentlemen who want to submit unanimous-consent requests, and I think we ought to have the point made now. It is important to know how many Members are absent from the House so we may know what we are up against.

Mr. TILSON. Let me say to the gentleman that there are only a few unanimous-consent requests to be made this morning, so far as I know, and there is no further business for to-day. Does not the gentleman think that we might omit the roll call to-day and have it to-morrow?

Mr. DYER. If the leader on this side makes the request, I should feel disposed not to make the point. My only purpose was to learn who are absent in order that the respective whips may know and notify them, because there is an important vote to be had to-morrow on a matter for which we were called here in special session. I think they ought to be here.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that I want five minutes, and the gentleman can make his point of order after I have concluded.

Mr. DYER. I would gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, but a number of Members on this side have a similar request. I think we better have the roll call now.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 11, 1929, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3548. An act to continue during the fiscal year 1930 Federal aid in rehabilitating farm lands in the areas devastated by floods in 1927;

H. R. 3600. An act to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act authorizing Maynard D. Smith, his heirs, successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.," approved

March 2, 1929, and being Public Act No. 923 of the Seventieth Congress;

H. R. 3663. An act making appropriations for the payment of certain judgments rendered against the Government by various United States courts;

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Hospital of Paris," approved January 30, 1913;

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to make available funds for carrying into effect the public resolution of February 20, 1929, as amended, concerning the cessions of certain islands of the Samoan group to the United States;

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the International Red Cross and Prisoners of War Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1929;

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the extension to the post-office building at Corinth, Miss.;

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to provide for the payment of certain expenses of the United States Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission; and

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution amending an appropriation for a consolidated school at Belcourt, within the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, N. Dak.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 13, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 3920) to provide for the aiding of farmers on wet lands in any State by the making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, levee and drainage districts, counties, boards of supervisors, and/or other political subdivisions and legal entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 3921) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish grades and an inspection service for canned foods in order to facilitate commerce therein, and to enable the consumers to purchase canned foods on the basis of quality, thereby lending encouragement to the producers of quality farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 3922) to provide for the purchase of sites and for the construction of post-office buildings in certain towns in the United States, and to provide for the issuance and sale of interest-bearing certificates for the creation of a fund for the purchase of such sites and the construction of such buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 3923) for the relief of dependents of innocent persons killed through attempts to enforce the prohibition law; to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 3924) for the relief of Pierre E. Teets; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 3925) granting an increase of pension to James K. Ferguson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 3926) granting a pension to Sarah C. Lane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3927) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) granting a pension to Katie Cummings; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3929) granting an increase of pension to George Archambault; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 3930) granting a pension to Elizabeth Langery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3931) granting an increase of pension to America V. Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 3932) for the relief of William W. Woodruff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3933) granting an increase of pension to Ida Millman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 3934) granting a pension to Allen R. Bybee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 3935) for the relief of Eugenia A. Helston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3936) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of John K. Kelley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3938) for the relief of John Lourim; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3939) for the relief of Lucius Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3940) for the relief of George Pettit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

653. By Mr. BURTNESS: Petition of 16 citizens of Pembina County, N. Dak., indicating opposition to the proposal of revising the present calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, June 13, 1929

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 4, 1929)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	La Follette	Smith
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Smoot
Barkley	Gillett	McNary	Stock
Bingham	Glass	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blaise	Glenn	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Goff	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Goldsbrough	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Greene	Nye	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Burton	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Hastings	Patterson	Tyson
Caraway	Hatfield	Philpotts	Vandenberg
Connally	Hawes	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Hefflin	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Sackett	Waterman
Dill	Jones	Schall	Watson
Edge	Kean	Sheppard	Wheeler
Fess	Keyes	Shortridge	
Fletcher	King	Simmons	

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] and request that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. NORBECK. My colleague [Mr. McMASTER] is unavoidably absent from the city.

Mr. HEFLIN. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is absent owing to illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BURTON presented a memorial numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the imposition of increased tariff duties on Sumatra tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGHAM presented a memorial of sundry laundry operators and persons engaged in the laundry-supply business in the State of Connecticut remonstrating against an increase in the tariff duties on soap-making oils and fats, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the League of Women Voters of the Territory of Hawaii, favoring the passage of legislation amending the organic act of the Territory, so as to enable women to serve as jurors in that Territory, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Charles L. Burdett Camp, No. 4, Department of Connecticut, United Spanish War Veterans, of Hartford, Conn., favoring the passage of the so-called Robinson bill, granting increased pensions to Spanish

War Veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the National Society of New England Women, in favor of requiring teachers and pupils to subscribe to the oath of allegiance, and the passage of legislation designating The Star-Spangled Banner as the American national anthem, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Society of New England Women, favoring the retention of the national-origins clause in the immigration law, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Swiss Society, of Waterbury, Conn., protesting against further reduction of immigration quotas, especially pertaining to Switzerland, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 102) making an appropriation for expenses of participation by the United States in the meeting of the International Technical Consulting Committee on Radio Communications to be held at The Hague in September, 1929, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 32) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent to report back from the Committee on Commerce without amendment a bill for the calendar. It is the bill (S. 153) granting consent to the city and county of San Francisco to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill to a point near the South Mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, in said State. I will state that the written report to accompany this bill is the report accompanying a similar bill in the last session of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and placed on the calendar, and leave is given to file the report indicated by the Senator from California (Rept. No. 33).

MILK RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 3317) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes," and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. This is the measure alluded to yesterday by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill to which he has alluded. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes" (Public, No. 1033, 70th Cong.), referring to the Milk River project, Montana, be amended to read as follows:

"Milk River project, Montana: For operation and maintenance, Chinook, Malta, and Glasgow divisions, \$17,000; continuation of construction, \$17,000; in all, \$34,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that to-day that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) to provide for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 1494) to establish the Ouachita National Park in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.